## Casse3::09-cv-03529-JSW Document 1249. Filed 06/03/11 Page 11:06f44

1 2	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP JAMI WINTZ MCKEON, State Bar No. 237 ELIZABETH A. FROHLICH, State Bar No. One Market, Spear Street Tower	923 195454
3	San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 Tel: 415.442.1000	
4	Fax: 415.442.1001	
5	jmckeon@morganlewis.com efrohlich@morganlewis.com	
6	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP CHRISTIAN J. MIXTER	
7	1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004-2541	
8	Tel: 202.739.3000 Fax: 202.739.3001	
9	cmixter@morganlewis.com	
10	Attorneys for Defendant Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.	
11	Bedisene Bank securities me.	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14	SAN FRAN	NCISCO DIVISION
15		
16	LOUISIANA PACIFIC CORPORATION,	Case No. CV09-03529-JSW
17	Plaintiff,	Honorable Jeffrey S. White – Courtroom 11
18	VS.	STIPULATION AND <del>[PROPOSED]</del> ORDER EXTENDING DEFENDANT DEUTSCHE
19	MONEY MARKET 1 INSTITUTIONAL INVESTMENT DEALER; MERRILL	BANK SECURITIES INC.'S TIME TO RESPOND TO THE SECOND AMENDED
20	LYNCH & CO., INC.; MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH	COMPLAINT, GRANTING LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITS ESTABLISHED
21	INCORPORATED; AND DEUTSCHE BANK SECURITIES INC.,	BY THE COURT'S CIVIL STANDING ORDERS AND SETTING BRIEFING
22	Defendants.	SCHEDULE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS
23		Second Am. Complaint filed: May 20, 2011
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

CV09-03529-JSW

DB2/22472607.3

1	Plaintiff Louisiana Pacific Corporation ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Deutsche Bank
2	Securities Inc. ("DBSI" or "Defendant"), by and through their respective counsel of record,
3	hereby stipulate as follows:
4	WHEREAS, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint ("FAC") on March 8, 2010;
5	WHEREAS, on April 21, 2010, DBSI filed a Motion to Dismiss and a Motion to Strike
6	portions of the FAC;
7	WHEREAS, on March 28, 2011, this Court issued an Order granting DBSI's Motion to
8	Dismiss with leave to amend and stating that "[i]f Plaintiff wishes to file a second amended
9	complaint as against DBSI, it shall do so by no later than April 29, 2011";
10	WHEREAS, the parties previously stipulated and the Court ordered that Plaintiff would
11	have until May 20, 2011 to file a Second Amended Complaint as against DBSI in this Action;
12	WHEREAS, Plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint ("SAC") on May 20, 2011;
13	WHEREAS, the SAC asserts several causes of action, including causes of action for
14	federal securities fraud, California securities fraud, and common law fraud claims against DBSI
15	in connection with auction-rate securities;
16	WHEREAS, the SAC alleges over the course of 265 paragraphs and 92 pages that DBSI
17	engaged in a comprehensive scheme to defraud Plaintiff in violation of Section 10(b) of the
18	Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5, that DBSI violated Sections 25500 and 25501
19	of the California Corporate Securities Law of 1968, and that DBSI committed common law fraud
20	WHEREAS, the SAC alleges wrongful conduct by DBSI in connection with at least eight
21	different series of auction-rate securities;
22	WHEREAS, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(3), DBSI's response to the
23	SAC is due to be filed on or before June 3, 2011;
24	WHEREAS, DBSI has informed Plaintiff that it expects to move to dismiss the SAC and
25	both parties have agreed that DBSI shall have until June 27, 2011 to make such a motion or to
26	answer or otherwise respond to the SAC;
27	WHEREAS, Plaintiff and DBSI agree that, should DBSI move to dismiss the SAC, the
28	SAC's scope and complexity warrant an increase in the page limits imposed by this Court's Civil

## Casse3::09-cv-03529-JSW Document 139 Filed 06/03/11 Page 330f 144

1	Standing Orders for DBSI's opening brief and Plaintiff's opposition to DBSI's motion to dismiss	
2	from 15 pages to 25 pages, but that the page limit for DBSI's reply brief shall be limited to 10	
3	pages (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table of contents, exhibits, and summaries of	
4	argument);	
5	WHEREAS, should DBSI file a motion to dismiss the SAC on June 27, 2011, Plaintiff	
6	and DBSI agree that the deadline for Plaintiff's filing of its opposition to DBSI's motion to	
7	dismiss should be extended until July 27, 2011 and that DBSI's reply brief shall be filed by	
8	August 10, 2011.	
9	IT IS THEREFORE STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Plaintiff and	
10	Defendant, acting through their respective counsel, subject to this Court's approval, as follows:	
11	1. DBSI shall answer or otherwise respond to the SAC on or before June 27, 2011;	
12	2. Should DBSI file a motion to dismiss on June 27, 2011, Plaintiff shall file its	
13	opposition papers on or before July 27, 2011, and DBSI shall file its reply papers on or before	
14	August 10, 2011;	
15	3. Should DBSI file a motion to dismiss, DBSI's memorandum of law in support of	
16	its motion to dismiss and Plaintiff's memorandum of law in opposition to DBSI's motion to	
17	dismiss shall not exceed 25 pages in length (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table of	
18	contents, exhibits, and summaries of argument); and	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

CV09-03529-JSW

DB2/22472607.3

## Casse3::09-cv-03529-JSW Document 139 Filed 06/03/11 Page 440f 44

1	4. DBSI's reply brief in support of its motion to dismiss shall not exceed 10 pages in	
2	length (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table of contents, exhibits, and summaries of	
3	argument).	
4		
5	Dated: June 3, 2011 KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD,	
6	EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.  Mark C. Hansen	
7	David L. Schwarz Kevin J. Miller Andrew C. Shen	
8	Andrew C. Shen	
9	By /s/ Andrew C. Shen	
10	Andrew C. Shen	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff Louisiana Pacific Corporation	
12	Dated: June 3, 2011 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	
13	Jami Wintz McKeon Christian J. Mixter	
14	Elizabeth A. Frohlich	
15		
16	By _/s/ Elizabeth A. Frohlich Elizabeth A. Frohlich	
17 18	Attorneys for Defendant Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.	
19	The Court HEREBY SETS a hearing on the motion for September 2, 2011 at 9:00 a.m.	
20	If the Court determines that the matter is suitable for resolution without oral argument, it will so advise the parties in advance of the hearing date.	
21	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
22		
23	Dated:June 3, 2011	
24	Mandahila deffrey S. White	
25	Jon Hable Jeffrey S. White United States District Judge	
26		
27 28		
/ X		

- 4 -